

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 MS. BRETT (BROOKE) SONIA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

Case No. C17-955-JLR-JPD

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

13
14 This is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter comes before
15 the Court at the present time on plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of this Court's prior Order
16 denying her motion to compel discovery. The Court, having considered plaintiff's motion, and
17 the balance of the record, hereby finds and ORDERS as follows:

18 (1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 55) is DENIED. Plaintiff seeks
19 reconsideration of this Court's March 15, 2018 Order denying her motion to compel discovery.
20 (Dkt. 54.) In that motion, plaintiff sought to compel defendants to respond to interrogatories and
21 requests for production directed to them in December 2017. (*See* Dkt. 41.) Plaintiff filed his
22 motion to compel after defendants had filed a motion for summary judgment and a motion for
23


ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 protective order asking that discovery be stayed pending the Court's ruling on their summary
2 judgment motion. (Dkts. 35, 39.) The Court granted defendants' motion for protective order on
3 the grounds that plaintiff had not demonstrated she required any additional discovery to respond
4 to defendants' summary judgment motion. (Dkt. 54 at 4.) The Court then denied plaintiff's
5 motion to compel discovery as moot. (*Id.*)

6 The Court will ordinarily deny motions for reconsideration "in the absence of a showing
7 of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
8 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has
9 not demonstrated any error in the Court's prior ruling, nor has she identified new facts or legal
10 authority which would justify a different result. In particular, plaintiff makes no showing that
11 additional discovery was required in order for her to adequately respond to defendants' summary
12 judgment motion, which she did in great detail. Moreover, the Court has now issued a Report
13 and Recommendation recommending that defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted.
14 Thus, any request for additional discovery at this juncture is clearly moot.

15 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff, to counsel for
16 defendants, and to the Honorable James L. Robart.

17 DATED this 21st day of May, 2018.

18
19 
20 JAMES P. DONOHUE
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23